

Karabagh is an Armenian-populated region that has declared its independence, but is still claimed by the neighboring Republic of Azerbaijan. A bloody war was fought earlier in this decade, with the Karabagh Armenians successfully defending their homelands. A ceasefire was accepted by both sides in 1994, but a political settlement has not been reached.

Under the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United States is a cochair of the negotiating group formed to resolve this conflict.

The United States and our OSCE partners have put forward a peace plan to resolve this conflict. Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh have both accepted the American-supported plan as a basis for negotiation, and Azerbaijan unfortunately has rejected the approach. Considering how policymakers in Congress and the administration have identified an establish the Caucasus region as a vital interest, we should do more to reward those countries which are willing to work constructively to resolve longstanding differences.

Mr. Speaker, President Kocharian's visit coincides with an important and tragic date. April 24 is solemnly commemorated as the anniversary of the unleashing of the genocide by the Ottoman Turkish empire of 1915 through 1923 that ultimately claimed the lives of 1.5 million Armenians.

There will be a reception tomorrow evening in commemoration of the genocide, as well as a series of speeches by Members of Congress. We cannot allow the world to forget the genocide. The lesson of the Armenian genocide should not be lost on us as we witness the heartbreaking TV images from Kosovo. Truly, a major justification for the NATO campaign is to try to ensure that the 20th century, which began in genocide, not end in genocide.

Back in the waning years of the Ottoman Empire, when Armenians were being murdered and deported, and their homes and communities burned and destroyed, and all record of the Armenian presence erased, there was no Western alliance of democracies like NATO committed to stopping aggression, brutality and genocide.

I just want to say in conclusion, I want to take this opportunity to express my admiration for our men and women in uniform who are fighting to stop the horrible ethnic cleansing of the Kosovar Albanians. At the same time, I urge the administration to assert far more pressure on Azerbaijan to constructively participate in the Nagorno Karabagh peace process.

As we remember the martyrs of the Armenian genocide, and as we witness the tragic events unfolding today in the Balkans, we must do all in our power to prevent another genocide in the mountains and valleys of Nagorno-Karabagh.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on the upcoming celebration this weekend of the 50th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and, of course, on the ongoing military operation against Yugoslavia.

The NATO allies will also meet for its annual summit and formally welcome the three new members, Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republics.

I was watching Nightline on Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, and the subject was NATO and its 50th anniversary. In one segment of the program, they went around Washington, D.C. and actually asked different citizens what they believed the role of NATO should be.

Most answered that NATO should be "peacekeepers for any conflict," or that NATO "should protect humanity," or they should stop genocide. With all due respect to their opinions, each of these Americans were not correct about what NATO's initial responsibility should be.

NATO was created to be solely a collective security arrangement for the Western allies against Soviet and Eastern Bloc aggression. NATO came into being 50 years ago when the U.S. joined its allies in signing the treaty on April 4, 1949. The U.S. Senate went on to ratify the treaty on July 21, 1949.

I am concerned with the current operations against Yugoslavia as a NATO operation. NATO does not have the authority under the current treaty terms to engage in the actions against Yugoslavia. By doing so, the stakes have been raised dramatically high. The President has allowed NATO to be put into a position that in order to prove its validity and effectiveness in a post-Cold War world, NATO has to win this war at all costs. This rigidity has prevented the administration and our NATO allies to take the sensible steps on seeking diplomatic solutions.

In fact, the administration last week flatly refused to consider a possible diplomatic opening that Germany was trying to seek with Yugoslavia.

Again, the President is intentionally raising the stakes in this engagement that makes anything less than our all-out victory a defeat. This strategy places U.S. prestige and ability to carry out our will in the world at tremendous risk. As stated before, this operation also brings into question the purpose of NATO in today's world.

The current operation against Yugoslavia is draining our military capability. There are some reports that the Navy was down to 200 cruise missiles in the theater of operation.

Nightline reported last night that out of over 6,000 sorties flown in the

last 28 days, only 1,700 have been bombing missions. After 6 years of stretching our military too thin, the administration has placed our Nation's military abilities at dangerously low levels.

The shrinking cruise missile supply, combined with our military having to convert our nuclear-tipped missiles to conventional warheads, places our abilities in a global scale at hazardous levels. If our Nation is faced with a second conflict, the security of the world is at great peril.

During this weekend's NATO summit, the NATO leaders will discuss changing the strategic concept of NATO from a defensive organization towards a more proactive force to combat new global risks such as proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. The administration seems to want NATO to be a global force ready to tackle any trouble in the world.

If this administration seeks to change the basic concept of NATO, it would violate the U.S. Constitution. Here is why. The treaty signed in 1949 was to provide for the defense of Western Europe. Any change to that treaty would require a new treaty, and therefore confirmation by the U.S. Senate by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. Speaker, it seems this administration is out to conduct a military action here. Secretary Madeleine Albright recently stated, "The military are our regulars now, so this is their job. What else would they be doing if we didn't give them their battles to fight?"

Secretary Albright also recently testified before Congress and said, "I would rather be up here defending myself for not having a plan than having to defend myself for not doing anything."

So, Mr. Speaker, when we have this kind of rhetoric from the White House, choosing to use our military in a questionable war because the military has "nothing better to do," or that their use without a strategy is better than "not doing anything," is when events like Vietnam occur.

AMERICA'S EXPORT CONTROL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our Nation's export control policy. Obviously, economic growth is a key to a prosperous future in this country, but that fact points out how important exports are.

When we look at the world right now, we have a unique situation where,

though the United States represents only 4 percent of the world's population, we currently consume 20 percent of the world's goods, services, and products.

In other words, if we are going to have economic growth in the country, we are going to have to open up foreign markets. We are going to have to export, and take advantage of that 96 percent of the world's population that does not reside in the United States.

When we look at it once again, the recent trade deficit figures just released today show another record trade deficit. There are a lot of issues that contribute to that. Today I would like to talk about just a couple that have to do with our export control policy, the policy of the United States in limiting the number of goods and products that can be exported from this country.

These are limited in a couple of ways. One of them is through what are called unilateral economic sanctions. That is basically where we as a country decide we disapprove of some action of another country, and then decide that we are not going to allow U.S. businesses to export to them.

I completely agree that we as a country need to stand up for things like democratic freedoms, religious freedoms, economic freedoms in the rest of the world, and do everything we can to encourage and promote those, but policies of unilateral economic sanctions do not get us there. Basically, all they do is force those countries to buy their goods from some other place.

The reason for this is the changing economy. As we have all heard, it has become a cliché now, we live in a global economy. What that means is if we attempt to impose our will on another country through unilateral economic sanctions, we will fail. It will not work, because that country can simply go to any one of the other members of this global economy and purchase what they want. All we accomplish in that situation is restricting our own companies' abilities to export.

Multilateral economic sanctions make a certain amount of sense. If we can get enough of our global partners together, as was in the case in South Africa, as is the case in Iraq, to institute export control policies so that it is not just us alone, the United States, then the policies can work and can exercise some influence to make some changes, as they did in South Africa.

What I am opposed to is the proliferation of unilateral economic sanctions that do not succeed in their stated goal and harm our economy. There are several bills in Congress right now that will attempt to change that policy. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the House bill, and I think we need to move in that direction.

I have brought a chart with me to illustrate the point. This chart shows the number of countries in the world

that currently have some export controls on them; in other words, the number of countries which U.S. businesses are somehow limited in their ability to export to. We can see that it is a large number of countries, as they are represented in red. They cover a substantial portion of the globe and a substantial number of people; in other words, possible markets that we are losing out on as a country.

If we could change that policy and open up those markets, it could be a boon to U.S. industry, and I must once again point out these policies have not had much effect on changing the policies of the other countries that we want to see changed.

So unilateral economic sanctions have reached the point where they do not work. All they are is bad for U.S. companies. If we want to expand and grow, we are going to need access to these markets. We need to make those changes to get there.

There are a couple of other aspects of our export controls policy right now that are particularly troubling because they focus on technology. In other words, they focus on the highest-growing segment of our economy, and indeed of the world's economy. They are controls on encryption software and on computers.

Basically, the U.S. has a policy right now that basically looks at technology and says, we need to develop the best technology here in this country, and then for national security reasons, we are going to put our arms around it and prevent the rest of the world from getting it, it will be protecting our national security.

There are a number of flaws with this theory, but the biggest one I want to point out is, once again, the global economy. There is access to this technology from other countries other than the U.S. We cannot stop that. By implementing these policies, all we are doing is restricting U.S. companies' ability to participate.

The biggest point I want to make on restrictions of technology, this is not, and I repeat, not a choice between business and national security. If that was the case, absolutely, we would choose national security, end of story. The point is it does not help because these countries access the information elsewhere.

Take encryption as just one example, a simple software designed to protect programs. We restrict the exportation of top-of-the-line encryption technology, but top-of-the-line encryption technology is available from a number of other countries, and in fact we can download it off the Internet.

Our restrictions do not prevent these other countries from getting it, they only prevent our countries from being the ones that are able to sell it. In the long run this even harms national security by restricting our ability to de-

velop the next best technology. We need to reexamine our policy of export controls for all of these reasons.

SUPPORT THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that the United States encourages economically reforming African countries. One of the ways to do that would be to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill that will really put Africa on the course of joining the world economy.

Africa is the poorest continent today, largely because of the state-dominated development strategy that predominated for the first three decades of its era of independence. It was called African socialism, and it did not work for Africa. It did not work for Africa any better than it worked in Eastern Europe.

□ 1300

Those economic policies help explain the difference today between a country like Ghana in West Africa and South Korea. In the early 1960s these two countries had similar per capita incomes. Ghana and most of Africa took the route of socialism, and they paid a very heavy price as a result.

Now, fortunately, many African countries, including Ghana, have changed course ever since the Berlin Wall came down. Ever since the West and Third World countries began to look at what had actually happened in Eastern Europe and in the former Soviet Union, they began liberalizing their economies. They began permitting private ownership of assets and becoming more welcoming of foreign investment and implementing the rule of law.

These reforms, which were encouraged by the United States and were undertaken with considerable political difficulty, have produced desirable results in many African countries. Many countries are seeing consistent economic growth of higher than 5 percent. In some, it is 10 percent, up to 17 percent growth rates per year.

These reforms advance America's many interests in Africa. It is very important when we think about this to realize that, realistically, the U.S. could not isolate itself from a 21st Century where Africa is suffering with increased war and social upheaval and environmental degradation or international terrorism and drug trafficking.

Growing economic means for Africa is an antidote for this scenario, translating into improved educational and health services, better environmental